

issuing issue #4

# THE ANGLICAN

A QUARTERLY NEWS-LETTER  
OF THE  
AMERICAN BRANCH  
OF  
THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY

---

Church Unity Number

---

TRINITY 1948

VOL. IV, NO. 1

---



## THE GREAT DIVIDE

### A Preface to Church Unity

The Rev. William H. Dunphy, Ph. D.

It is frequently assumed that the differences which divide the Church from the various denominations of modern origin are simply differences over the question of orders, sacraments and the like. These differences are, of course, important, but the grounds of separation lie far deeper. What is really at stake is the very nature of the Christian religion, the very conception of salvation itself. Does salvation lie wholly in the future, the other side of death or the other side of the Resurrection—is it purely an eschatological matter—or is salvation a present reality as well? Does the Church look forward to a new creation at the last day, or is the Church herself the new creation? Is the Christian saved only by hope, or is he already a new creature, a new creation in Christ? Reformation and neo-Reformation theology take the former position; Catholic Christianity the second.

It ought to be recognized far more widely and far more clearly than it is that this difference regarding the new creation underlies and colors all the differences as regards the question of the Church, the ministry, the sacraments, the guardianship of Christian truth, etc. The Catholic Christian believes that the Church is really “the Body of Christ, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.” The new creation has already begun. Divine life is given to us not only in hope but in reality, in this Church. Grace is really recreating, transforming, renewing. Christ does not merely pretend that we are saved, but He actually saves us, and He begins this work of saving us here and now.

The Reformers held that the merits of Christ were imputed to the believing soul. Catholic Christianity holds that they are not merely imputed but *imparted*. That is, as St. Paul says, “If any man is in Christ, he is a new creation.” Luther compared grace to a magnificent golden robe thrown over a corpse. But Catholic Christianity thinks of the corpse—our natural fallen humanity—as being not covered over, but given life. Reformation theology held that man was totally depraved to the roots of his being and therefore could not cooperate with God’s grace in the work of salvation. One is reminded of the story of the sweet little Presbyterian girl saying proudly to her Episcopalian playmate, “You are only a miserable sinner. I’m totally depraved.”

Catholic Christianity held that man was "weakened and wounded" by sin, that he was "very far gone from original righteousness," but that he was still capable of responding to the grace of God. The image of God was not effaced in man, though it was sadly defaced, and the Christian born anew in Holy Baptism by water and the Spirit is capable of taking an active part in the work of his own salvation, always, of course, in response to the grace of Christ. In other words, divine grace makes a radical change in man here and now. A new life is given him in Holy Baptism, making him a new creature, a new creation, and this life is continually nourished and sustained by the gift of our Lord's life-giving humanity, given to us in the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. Man is not simply externally forgiven, but inwardly changed, cleansed, made alive.

Reformation and neo-Reformation theology are on the other side of the fence in all of these matters. The view taken of creation, sin and salvation is entirely different. The Reformers and their present-day successors tend to hold that "man, having been created in the image of God, has had that image not only spoiled and stained throughout, but annihilated through the Fall. He is thus no longer capable of having any knowledge of God apart from Jesus Christ." ("The Great Misunderstanding," by Denzil G. M. Patrick—In "The Student World"—Second Quarter, 1937—p. 135.)

Of course, "God is really present in the life of the believer. That presence, however, does not imply any *ontological* change in the nature of the believer during the course of this present life, while he is in a state of grace; any such change is reserved for the state of glory—the future fulfilment of all the promises of God, when the last enemy, death, shall have been destroyed. The presence which is actually operative now within man's life is an *eschatological* one . . ."

Patrick acutely recognizes that this gulf between Catholicism and Protestantism cannot be bridged. He himself is definitely on the side of Reformation and continental Protestantism. He rightly speaks of the "fundamental *decision* which fixes the great gulf between the Catholic and the Protestant. That decision is: EITHER to affirm *both* the *ontological* presence (in the sacramental elements, the believer while in this life, the Church militant) *and* the *eschatological*—with the emphasis heavily upon the *ontological*: that is the decision of Catholicism; OR to affirm *only* the *eschatological* and *actual* presence, and to deny the *ontological* as a fundamental misrepresentation of the mode of the justification and reconciliation given to man by God: that is the decision of Protestantism" . . . "And so it is really a *decision* which confronts Christendom: a decision as between the 'both-and' of Catholicism and the

'either-or' of Protestantism. A clear understanding of this issue is the necessary pre-condition of any fruitful work for 'Christian unity.'

Patrick sees that "the typically Anglo-Saxon Reformation—the English one—did not mean a complete rejection of all ontological categories in relation to the Christian life, but only a partial one, which the Anglican Communion is steadily engaged upon revoking at the present time; whereas the Continental Reformation, of which the Scottish Reformation and English Nonconformity are heirs, did mean that complete and irrevocable rejection."

Patrick states the question very well, although he gives what, from the Catholic point of view, is the wrong answer. His phrasing of the alternative could scarcely be improved upon, except for the clause, "with the emphasis heavily on the ontological." In reality, Catholicity—at least Eastern Orthodoxy, and Western Catholicism at its best—keeps a true balance between the eschatological and the ontological. Protestantism practically denies the second. Roman Catholicism, and sometimes Anglicanism, tend to stress the first one-sidedly. The Catholic faith holds both in balance.

The poverty of the Protestant idea of salvation is responsible for the impoverished idea of the Church and the Sacraments.

Once salvation is divorced, so far as this life is concerned, from the reality of the new creation—of the Church as the bearer of a divine—human life, imparted to Christians in the Sacraments,—then the way is open to regarding the Sacraments as merely seals of forgiveness, bestowed without any real change in the inner state of the Christian. The reduction of the Sacraments to mere signs or tokens is made by the Zwinglians, but the seeds of it are already found in Luther himself. Thus in baptism the Christian is forgiven, or at all events receives the seal of forgiveness, but the merits of Christ are imputed to him, not imparted. He is not, in the New Testament and Catholic sense of the words, a new creation.

Again, although Luther believed and taught the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Communion, the effect of this Sacrament is reduced to the confirmation of our faith in the remission of sins—it becomes a token of our forgiveness. There is no question of a new life really given in baptism, really renewed and sustained in the Holy Eucharist. There is no question of really new men, men made new by the grace of Christ. The whole conception of salvation is too legalistic and external. The unrighteousness of the old Adam cleaves to us inwardly, whereas the righteousness of Christ is given to us only externally,—is imputed, not imparted. It would seem as if the Reformers and their Barthian and near-

Barthian successors have reversed the saying of St. Paul and taught that where grace abounded, sin did much more abound.

Liberal Protestantism is apparently at the opposite pole from the Reformation and neo-Reformation theology, but they both agree in admitting no new creation in this life. Liberal Protestantism denies or explains away original sin; therefore there is no need of man becoming a new creature. If there is no radical evil in man, there is no need of a radical change in man; no need of a re-birth of the water and the Spirit. Man is saved by knowledge and inspiration. Christ becomes an example, rather than a life-bringer; a dead teacher rather than a living Saviour. Here too there is no place for the conception of the Church as the new creation, or of the Christian born anew by the regenerating action of the Holy Spirit in baptism, and thus made a new creature.

It would seem logical to go a step further, and from denying the new creation in the Church and the regenerated Christian, to go on to the denial of a new creation, even in Christ Himself. A great deal of recent Protestantism has taken this step. It is interesting to observe how Liberal Protestant critics and some of the neo-Reformation form-critics agree in throwing out our Lord's miracles as being a reading-back by the Church of the glory of the ascended Lord into the period of His earthly life. The one-sided Protestant emphasis on the eschatological—its denial of a new creation here and now—leads logically to the denial of everything supernatural in the "Jesus of History." It tends to deny that "in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," even during His earthly life. The fatal tendency works itself out to disastrous results, and we finally come to have no certain knowledge even of the "Jesus of History." All we have, according to one distinguished form-critic, is "the echo of an echo and the whisper of a whisper."

Catholic Christianity on the other hand, including historic Anglicanism, accepts whole-heartedly the reality of the Incarnation, of the manifestation of the glory of God in the humanity of our Lord, of the Word made flesh, and hence naturally accepts the Church as the extension of the Incarnation. All of this has an important bearing on the question of the ministry and Church Order. If the Christian has nothing to do but to hear the Word of God by faith, then we need no ministerial succession. At most we might require a series of preachers of the Word. No organic continuity is necessary. The Apostolic succession becomes almost meaningless.

But to Catholic Christianity, including historic Anglicanism, the Church is the Sacrament of Christ's life embodied and given to the world. She is the extension of the Incarnation. She is herself the New Creation. Christians do not come first and form the Church, but the Church comes

first and Christians are gathered into her, and in so doing are incorporated into the life of Christ, the one Head of the Church. The Church, as the body of Christ, is one continuous organism down the ages, from the Day of Pentecost to the present day. The chief visible mark of her continuity is her ministerial priesthood, and in particular the Episcopate—the Bishops, the successors of the Apostles to whom our Lord said, “As my Father hath sent me even so send I you,” “He that heareth you heareth me.” In union with this Church and only in union with her can we have the assurance of receiving the life of Christ, God Incarnate, and of knowing the truth of Christ, which He died to bring us. Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ and in the Church the fulness of that grace and truth are found forevermore.

## ANGLICANISM AND REUNION

**The Rev. William H. Dunphy**

*An Address before the Commission on Unity, Washington, D.C.,  
October 28, 1947.*

The unity which we envisage in the Anglican Society is the kind of unity which is involved in the principles which are expressed by the Book of Common Prayer, or implied by it. A definite faith and order are enshrined in the Prayer Book and underlie it. There is happily no peculiarly Anglican faith or order—there is no such thing as the Episcopal religion—but rather there is the faith and order of the whole Catholic Church as it existed prior to the great division between East and West, and the elements in this faith and order which have been retained by the separate parts of this Church since the division.

We can never be satisfied with a union with any one denomination of such a sort that it would destroy our union with the greater part of Christendom. A Pan-Protestant union cannot be our aim. Still less can we be satisfied with the union of the various denominations and Churches in Britain and America, a sort of English Speaking Union at prayer.

We must remember what the map of Christendom as a whole looks like. The Roman Catholic Church embraces nearly one-half of Christendom, the Orthodox Eastern Churches another quarter; all the Protestant bodies put together still another quarter; our own Church, small in numbers, but occupying a strategic position in regard to all of them. It might be possible, working along the lines envisaged in some of the proposed Concordats of recent years, to produce a scheme of unity which might hope to take in one-eighth of Christendom, namely, that part of Christen-

dom which was Calvinistic or Reformed in origin, and which now inclines more or less in the direction of Liberal Protestantism. Such a scheme of unity, however, would have no hope of success with the great body of Lutherans throughout the world. It would not appeal to many other elements of Protestantism, and it would permanently separate us from Catholic Christendom as a whole, both Roman and Orthodox.

Any such "union" as this would involve a hopeless break with our own past and with the great majority of Christians of the present day, and would certainly split the Anglican Communion in two. The Anglican Church appealed at the Reformation, and has continued to appeal ever since, to the Holy Scriptures as interpreted by the "Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops," (canons of 1571, etc.) This appeal has been constantly reiterated, especially in the preamble to the Chicago quadrilateral—which lies behind the Lambeth quadrilateral. In the Chicago Quadrilateral our Bishops declared clearly:

"We do hereby affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired . . . can be restored only by the return of all Christian Com-munions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence; which prin-ciples we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or sur-  
render by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men."

This preamble simply sums up the historic position of Anglicanism, and it is in the light of it that the Lambeth Quadrilateral and other approaches to unity must be considered. It should be noticed that it envisages the unity of Christendom, not as an aggregation of all denominations of Christendom, but rather as the integration of Christians into the one original and still existing Catholic Church and that it envisages the problem in its world-wide aspect, not simply the American or the Anglo-Saxon scene, and that it holds that there is such a thing as a divine constitution of the Church which cannot be altered or surrendered, even in the supposed interest of unity, the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world." "As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and there-fore as essential to the restoration of unity" it lists the four points subse-quently taken over by the Lambeth Quadrilateral. These four points never stood alone or could stand alone. They must be interpreted in the light of the life and the living tradition of Anglicanism, and beyond that of the Church Catholic as a whole.

In line with this is the statement of the sub-committee of the Lambeth Conference (1930) on the Unity of the Church—report No. 3—

“When, therefore, we say that we must insist on the Historic Episcopate but not upon any theory or interpretation of it, we are not to be understood as insisting on the office apart from the functions. What we uphold is the Episcopate, maintained in successive generations by continuity of succession and consecration, as it has been throughout the history of the Church from the earliest times, and discharging those functions which from the earliest times, it has discharged.”

As regards the Roman Catholic Church, the words of Archbishop Laud are still true. We cannot hope for such union “until Rome be other than she is.” At the same time the Lambeth Conference declared that no scheme of unity could be satisfactory which did not include the great Latin Church of the West. To speak of the unity of the whole of Christendom except for the Roman Catholic Church is like speaking of including the whole circle except for a semicircle. At all events we must avoid doing anything which would widen the breach with the Churches which at present are subject to the Papacy. We must avoid enfeebling the position of our own Church in the face of Rome. We must avoid doing anything which would play into the hands of Roman controversialists, to the effect that Anglicanism is simply a modern man-made sect without any deep-rooted faith or principles. The Holy Spirit is working in the Roman Communion as well as outside it, and our steadfast witness to Catholic faith and order may some day be the means of helping the Churches subject to Rome to throw off the autocratic papal yoke and recover a catholicity both older and purer than that of modern Rome.

As regards the Christian bodies deriving from the Reformation, our position does not exclude, but necessarily implies, a deep and warm sympathy with the Reformation on its positive side. We need always to distinguish between the Catholic Reality and its imperfect realization in the Church of any given place and time. Luther rebelled against a catholicism which was not fully Catholic. He insisted, and rightly insisted, on the freedom of the Christian man. He insisted rightly on the necessity of an inner existential relation of the Christian to truth and grace. Unfortunately his protest took a one-sided form and led to the loss of certain vital elements of faith and order. However, the early Lutherans did not as a rule regard their ministerial and other arrangements as final, and they, like Anglicans, appeals to a General Council of the whole Catholic Church to settle their differences with Rome. Many of them regarded their ministry as an extraordinary ministry, raised up by God to meet an extraordinary situation. If this point of view is still prevalent among them

today, we might explore the possibilities of union with some prospect of success.

The doctrinal differences between Anglicanism and the Lutheranism of the Augsburg Confession are not necessarily insurmountable. At any rate we ought to see what approaches can be made to unity with the Lutherans, and more especially with the Church of Sweden, which has a strong claim to having preserved the Apostolic succession unbroken.

The denominations deriving from Calvin and Zwingli are in a very different situation. With them there was a much clearer break with the faith and order of Catholic Christendom. This is particularly true of the Presbyterians. They from the first presented their system, not as a temporary expedient in an extraordinary era, but as an institution obligatory by divine right, and as an alternative which must supplant the faith and order of the historic Catholic Church. Today they have very widely abandoned this latter claim, but still reject the episcopate and the ministerial priesthood in their historic sense. Their conception of the Church is radically different from that of Anglicanism, and there seems little hope of bridging the gulf in the near future.

Our best hope of unity lies in our approach to Churches, which like our own, hold the historic Catholic faith and order, while rejecting the papal supremacy and the late medieval accretions to catholicity which grew up in Western Christendom. In particular we should seek approaches to unity with the Eastern Orthodox Church. Much progress has been made in this direction, most of its prior to 1930. But very little has been done since then. It is time that we explore further the possibilities in this direction.

In the meantime we must seek closer unity among ourselves and avoid everything which may destroy or weaken such unity as we already possess. The double character of our Church as Catholic and as reformed must be preserved. The tragedy of Western Christendom since the sixteenth century has been that the elements of tradition on the one hand, and of reform and protest on the other, have been separated. The two belong together, just as the salt and the thing it is supposed to savor and preserve belong together.

In our steadfast witness to the two-fold character of our own Church, in our loyalty to the principles of faith, order and worship set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, in our common endeavor to avoid fragmentation, and to attain a more perfect realization of the Catholic reality enshrined in our own Church, we shall make our greatest contribution to the reunion of Christendom as a whole—to the attainment of the kind of unity for which our Lord prayed—a unity of faith, not of indifference; not a dead formal unity, but a living organic one.

## EDITORIALS AND COMMENTS

---

### LAMBETH AND THE SOUTH INDIA SCHEME

Of all the problems to come before the Lambeth Conference, none is more important than that of Christian unity. It is to be hoped that further steps will be taken looking to the ultimate reunion of our own Church with other historic parts of the Holy Catholic Church, notably with Eastern Orthodoxy. Unfortunately little has been said, and apparently little has been thought, about this vital question. Much more to the fore is the question of the so-called South India United Church, a new Protestant sect which was supposed to combine Episcopal, Presbyterian and Congregational elements in its polity and doctrine. However, the Episcopal or Anglican element has been so diluted as to be virtually non-existent.

The standards of belief of this new sect are extremely vague, and it is very doubtful whether there is any intention of continuing the ministerial priesthood in the sense in which Catholic Christendom has always understood that term. Such Orders as these, even if conferred by Bishops who themselves possess Apostolic succession—such as the ex-Anglican Bishops who have entered the new denomination—would be in all probability judged invalid by the standards of Western Catholic Christendom. They would certainly be invalid from the standpoint of Eastern Orthodoxy, since there is no intention either of continuing any existing part of the Church, or of introducing the South India Community into the bosom of any Church now in existence.

In this connection the decree of the late Sergius, Patriarch of Moscow, dealing with the Western Orthodox Community, which was received into union with Orthodoxy a few years ago, is of importance. The consecration received by Msgr. Winnaert at the hands of Bishop Wedgwood, himself a Bishop of one of the doubtful off-shoots from the old Catholic Movement, was judged invalid on this very ground.

*“En dehors de tout jugement sur la validité des ordinations vieux-catholique, la consécration épiscopale reçue par Mgr Winnaert de Wedgwood, en elle-même est douteuse. Elle peut être considérée comme une consécration ‘errante,’ (vagans); cas assez fréquent de nos jours, à ce qu'il paraît, dans les milieux non orthodoxes. Wedgwood a accompli cette consécration pour une communauté, sans*

avoir la moindre intention d'introduire cette communauté dans le sein de son Eglise, ni de recevoir Winnaert dans le corps de sa hiérarchie. Il leur laissait la liberté d'aller où bon leur semblait et d'organiser leur vie ecclésiastique selon leur propre gré. De son côté, Winnaert lui-même s'addressant à Wedgwood pour obtenir la consécration, n'agissait que de manière fortuite, ne prenant en considération qu'un indice extérieur; il voulait obtenir de lui une consécration plus ou moins incontestable et, à ce qu'il paraît, ne se souciait guère du degré de catholicité en doctrine et en organization du groupe Wedgwood."

The objections which the Patriarch makes on the grounds of both Faith and Order apply fully to the so-called South India United Church. The words of Bishop Walter Carey in the "Church Times" for June 4th of this year ought to be weighed very carefully. Bishop Carey is well known as an ardent lover of Church Unity, one who appreciates fully all that is good and true in Protestantism, and also for his championship of the principles which the Anglican Society exists to maintain. This is what he says:

"There is a caucus, or body of bishops who, in agreement or not, are determined to force recognition of the South India experiment on the Church of England. We saw it at SPG. We see it in the determined use of phrases like "The new Church in South India," which imply that people can form a new Church at their own sweet will, or with sanctions which are not those of the Anglican Communion. Those who act thus are either Pan-Protestants, who count the Church of England as a sect which happens to retain episcopacy; or prelates who do not govern with synod, but by *ipse dixit*. They have a deficient sense of the Church as the mystical Body of Christ, and think that episcopal government is convenient and dignified, and no more. If they had realized that episcopacy is the sacramental link (by the laying-on of apostolic hands) with the Apostles and their first commission—as Holy Communion is a sacramental link with the Lord's Supper—then they would understand why we who hold our apostolic commission and sacramental links with Christ and the Apostles dearer than life will never give in.

"If they attempt to deprive the Anglican Communion of its principle of apostolic ordination, they will split the Anglican Communion in half. We are Churchmen, not sentimentalists who for the sake of a facade of unity will throw the principles and foundations of the Anglican Communion to the winds."

## AN IMPORTANT THEOLOGICAL DOCUMENT

The Statement of Faith and Order prepared for submission to the Lambeth Conference by the Joint Commission on Approaches to Unity is an important document. On the whole the statement is excellent. It adopts and approves statements which appeared in the original Chicago Quadrilateral, but which unhappily were omitted from the so-called Lambeth Quadrilateral in its various forms. Thus the Commission includes the statement:

“We do hereby affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence; which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian Faith and Order committed by Christ and His Apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men.”

It is evident that this appeal to the Catholic Fathers and Councils serves as a key to the interpretation of the principles and the language of the Chicago Quadrilateral itself, as regards, for example, the historic Episcopate. This was cherished in the undivided Church, not as a venerable relic of antiquity, but as essential to a valid priesthood, and therefore to the very being of the Church.

The elucidation of the part of the Quadrilateral dealing with the Holy Scriptures is unobjectionable in itself, but ought to have contained a reference to the fact set forth in the thirty-nine Articles that the “Church hath authority in controversies of faith.” Nothing is more necessary in our approaches to unity with the Eastern Orthodox Churches than to clarify the Anglican position as to tradition. One would wish that the statement agreed upon by the Orthodox and Anglican representatives of the Joint Doctrinal Commission appointed by the Ecumenical Patriarch and Archbishop of Canterbury might have been included at this point:

“Everything necessary for salvation can be founded upon Holy Scripture as completed, explained, interpreted, and understood in the Holy Tradition, by the guidance of the Holy Spirit residing in the Church.

“We agree that by Holy Tradition we mean the truths which came down from our Lord and the Apostles through the Fathers,

which are confessed unanimously and continuously in the Undivided Church, and are taught by the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

"We agree that nothing contained in Tradition is contrary to the Scriptures. Though these two may be logically defined and distinguished, yet they cannot be separated from each other nor from the Church." (From the "Report of the Joint Doctrinal Commission," S. P. C. K.—1932.)

The section dealing with the Creeds is ambiguous. The statement is made, "while liberty of interpretation may be allowed, the Christian faith as set forth in these two Creeds ought to be received and believed by all Christian people." How much liberty of interpretation may be allowed? Is one, for example, to be allowed to deny the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, under the guise of exercising legitimate liberty of interpretation? May the Creed thus be made to say the opposite of what it was designed to teach? Or does the appeal to the undivided Church of the Fathers govern the interpretation of the Creed as a whole? This would appear to be a logical position, but it ought to have been clearly stated.

The section dealing with the Sacraments is very good and recognizes, in addition to baptism and the Supper of the Lord, the five other "sacramental rites or mysteries"—the minor sacraments as they are commonly called. The section of the historic Episcopate is a great improvement on most of those which have appeared in recent years. The following passage is excellent:

"The Church is set before us in the New Testament as a body of believers having within it, as its recognized focus of unity, of teaching and of authority, the Apostolate, which owned its origin to the action of the Lord Himself. There was not first an Apostolate which gathered a body of believers about itself; nor was there a completely structureless collection of believers which gave authority to the Apostles to speak and act on its behalf. From the first there was the fellowship of believers finding its unity in the Twelve. Thus the New Testament bears witness to the principles of a distinctive ministry, as an original element, but not the sole constitutive element, in the life of the Church.

It is to be hoped that the Anglican Bishops assembled at Lambeth will consider this theological statement very carefully. With certain additions it might well serve as the basis of their own teaching and action in regard to the reunion of Christendom.

## TRADITION AND CHRISTIAN UNITY

At at time when many within the Anglican Church seek unity up the blind alley of pan-Protestantism or of Papalism, it is both refreshing and instructive to go back to some of the really great thinkers of the seventeenth century, which in some respects was the golden age of Anglicanism. For example, on the subject of tradition—a matter on which Episcopalian become singularly tongue-tied in conferring with our Protestant friends about Reunion—Archbishop Bramhall has much to teach us.

“If he [his R. C. opponent] except, that the bare letter of Scripture is not the ground or rule of Faith to R. C.’s, but the Scripture interpreted according to the analogy of Faith and tradition of the Church: the Church of England Saith the same thing for itself. So if this be ‘the source of all error’—to abandon the tradition of the Church, we are far enough from ‘the source of all error’ . . . What he attributeth to ‘the tradition of immediate forefathers,’ I ascribe to the perpetual and universal tradition of the Catholic Church.”

(Bramhall’s *Works*, Oxford 1842, p. 630)

“You say that our “Calvinistic Reformation” (so you are pleased to call it as you would have it, for the moderate and orderly Reformation of England was the terror and eyesore of Rome) “is founded upon two maxims,” the one, that “the Church was fallen to ruin and desolution, and become guilty of idolatry and tyranny.”

“That is neither our foundation, nor our superstructure; neither our maxim, nor our opinion. It is so far from it, that we hold and teach the direct contrary. First, that the ‘Gates of Hell shall never prevail against Universal Church;’ . . . it shall never fall to ruin or desolution, because it is founded upon a rock.’ Secondly, we believe that the Catholic Church is the faithful spouse of Christ, and cannot be guilty of idolatry, which is spiritual adultery. Thirdly, we never said, we never thought, that the Oecumenical Church of Christ was guilty of tyranny.” (p. 42)

“There is a vast difference between the Catholic Church and a Patriarchal Church. The Catholic Church can never fail, a ‘Patriarchal’ may apostate and fail.” (p. 43)

“We do not accuse the Roman *Church* of tyranny, but the Roman *Court*.” (p. 47)

“This [appeal to the Faith of the Catholic Church and tradition] hath always been the doctrine and the practice of our English

Church. First, it is so far from admitting laymen to be directive interpreters of Holy Scripture, that it allows not this liberty to clergymen, so much as to 'gloss upon the text,' until they be 'licensed to become preachers.' (Canons of 1603, can. 49.) . . . 'It forbids the licensed preachers to teach the people any doctrine as necessary to be religiously held and believed, which the Catholic Fathers and old Bishops of the Primitive Church, have not collected out of the Scriptures.' (q. Can. 1571, tit 'Concionatores.') It ascribes a judgment of *jurisdiction* over preachers to Bishops . . . It gives a power of determining all emergent controversies of Faith above Bishops to the Church, as to 'the witness and the keeper of the Sacred Oracles,' and to a 'lawful Synod' as the 'representative Church.'" (p. 52)

"We are so far from believing that 'we cannot admit Tradition without allowing the Papacy,' that one of the principal motives why we have rejected the Papacy, as it is now established with universality of jurisdiction by the institution of Christ, and superiority above Oecumenical Councils, and infallibility of judgment, was the constant tradition of the Primitive Church." (p. 53)

As for the authority of the Church and its Councils:

"We are most ready in all our differences to stand to the judgment of the truly Catholic Church, and its lawful representative, a free general Council. But we are not willing to have their 'virtual Church,' that is, the Court of Rome, obtruded upon us for the Catholic Church, nor a partial Synod of Italians for a free general Council." (p. 100)

Finally, as to the crucial question, Who are Catholics:

"Whosoever doth preserve his obedience entire to the universal Church, and its representative, a General Council, and to all his superiors in their due order, so far as by law he is obliged; who holds an internal communion with all Christians, and an external communion so far as he can with a good conscience; who approves no reformation but that which is made by lawful authority, upon sufficient grounds, with due moderation; who derives his Christianity by the uninterrupted line of Apostolical succession; who contents himself with his proper place in the ecclesiastical body; who disbelieves nothing in Holy Scripture, and if he holds any errors unwillingly, doth implicitly renounce them by his fuller and more firm adherence to that infallible rule; who believeth and practiceth all those

*credenda* and *agenda*, which the universal church spread over the face of the earth doth unanimously believe and practice as necessary to salvation, without condemning or censuring others of different judgment from himself on inferior questions, without obtruding his own opinions upon others as articles of Faith; who is implicitly prepared to believe and do all other speculative and practical truths, when they shall be revealed to him; and, in sum, 'qui sententiam diversae opinionis vinculo non paeponit unitatis'—'that prefers not a subtlety or an imaginary truth before the bond of peace,' he may securely say, 'My name is Christian, my surname is Catholic'” (p. 111f).

What a different form the South India scheme might have taken had its proponents been mindful of these truths, and what a different form might our own proposals for union with the Presbyterians and other Christians have taken. There would be real hope in that case of attaining the kind of unity which our Lord wills and for which He prayed—a Unity in truth, not in agreement to differ about the truth; a Unity of life, not a political make-shift.

“It would not be a step towards Christian Reunion if the Anglican Communion were to abandon the position in regard to the Apostolic Ministry which it holds in common with the Catholic three-fourths of Christendom in order to draw nearer to the Protestant one-fourth of Christendom. And if the Episcopal Church were to abandon, or compromise, its Catholic belief as to the Church and the Apostolic Ministry in order to unite with one among the Protestant Churches, this would not be a step towards Christian Reunion but a step directly away from it. If the Episcopal Church took such action it would repudiate its own spiritual heritage, it would separate itself from the rest of the Anglican Communion, it would abandon its position in relation to the Catholic Churches of the World, and it would cast away its opportunity to serve as a “Bridge Church” and as a reconciling influence between Catholicism and Protestantism. Those who urge such action are not thinking of Reunion in world-wide terms, they are not taking a broad view but a limited and local view. They are thinking only of Protestant Union and not of the Reunion of the whole Church of Christ. For the deep and increasing desire for Christian Unity we must all be thankful, but we must beware of hasty and ill-advised projects which would make new divisions instead of healing old ones, and would injure instead of aiding the cause of Christian Reunion.” (From the Convention Address of the Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, D. D., LL. D., D. C., Bishop of New York—1946.)

## LAMBETH AND MARRIAGE

Other vital questions will come up for discussion at the Lambeth Conference in addition to the question of Church Unity. None of these is more important than that of holy matrimony. It is to be hoped that there will be no compromise on our Lord's teaching; that at least Christian marriage, once entered into, is strictly indissoluble.

Unhappily in this matter, no less than in the matter of Church Unity, the compromisers are already busy. Thus the Bishop of Rochester (England) leans toward the opinion that the Orthodox Church is right—he should have said that certain Orthodox theologians and canonists are right—in interpreting persistent infidelity as “death” of the otherwise indissoluble union of marriage. Had a Roman Catholic writer used such language, he would at once have been denounced as guilty of “Jesuitry.” One wonders if the Bishop is prepared to adopt the dozen or more causes of divorce allowed by the Code Justinian and subsequent canonical codes of the Eastern Church. Surely Friedrich Heiler is right when he speaks of the laxity of the Orthodox Church on this question as being “ein dunkler Punkt im Leben der orthodoxen Kirche.” (*Urkirche und Ostkirche*—Page 282.)

But what is most extraordinary is that the Bishop adds: “Personally, I am inclined to believe that the Orthodox Church has preserved all down the ages of Christendom the true Christian tradition; and that a study of the conception of the death of marriage is long overdue.” (*Five Questions Before the Church*—Page 36.)

No patristic scholar of any standing would agree with the Bishop in this matter. The ante-Nicene Fathers are perfectly clear as to the indissolubility of holy matrimony, and no suggestion that divorce with re-marriage is legitimate comes from them. Not a word is said by them as to any metaphorical “death” dissolving the marriage. They are absolutely loyal to the clear teaching of our Lord that marriage is indissoluble. Not one of them interprets even the exceptive clause of Matthew as permitting re-marriage after divorce. It is to be hoped that the Lambeth Fathers will be guided by the New Testament and early Fathers rather than by the example of those who found the laxity of the half-heathen Court of Byzantium too much for them.

The Church has gained her great victories over paganism both in religion and morals, not by surrendering to this paganism or compromising with it, but by unflinching loyalty, even to the death, to the teaching of our Lord and of His Church in its purest ages.

## A VISIT TO AUSTRALIA

The Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, D. D., S. T. D.  
Bishop of Albany

My visit to Australia was to represent our Church at the centenary observance of the three Dioceses of Adelaide, Newcastle and Melbourne whose first Bishops were all consecrated in Westminster Abbey in 1847. The travels and achievements of these pioneers make a fascinating and heroic story. They laid solid and enduring foundations which have resulted in the present-day Church of Australia, with its imposing Cathedrals, its many Churches and Schools, and its farflung and many-sided parochial life.

It is a long way to Australia, though today the journey can be made by air in a few days. Mrs. Oldham and I travelled by train across the continent, then by the Matson Line to Honolulu, and from there by air, a distance of over 5,000 miles. We made two stops for fueling on atolls in mid-Pacific, namely, Canton and Nandi in the Fiji Islands where we had time to visit a native village. We landed in the beautiful harbor of Sydney at 9:00 A. M., October 27th, and repaired immediately to Bishops-court, the home of the Archbishop. After two days we flew to Canberra, Australia's Washington in embryo, where we met the Bishop, Prime Minister and others, and I made several addresses. Then we flew to Adelaide, arriving on Saturday in time for the final showing of the Pageant which we attended with the Bishop and Governor General. It was a truly remarkable performance, depicting the history of the past century and participated in by 700 persons from a score of parishes under the direction of a professional actor.

On Sunday I preached in the Cathedral and during the week addressed several schools and other civic and religious groups. After this we took plane for Sydney and then motored to Newcastle where a similar program was arranged. We then flew to Melbourne where the chief feature was a Church Congress at which I made three addresses.

The Church in Australia is typically British. The Bishops have their palaces and rather spacious grounds—though with shortages of domestic help today these prove a burden—but they wear gaiters on ceremonial occasions only. Each Diocese has its Cathedral, all large and some very beautiful. There are also numerous and splendid Church Schools. Numerically, the Anglican Communion represents about forty per cent of the population, the largest of any religious group, though it does not appear to have the political influence of the more compact and disciplined Roman Catholic Church. The Church seems much alive to its missionary

opportunities. It is almost solely responsible for the work in Tanganyika and New Guinea where it has thriving missions, and at home there is the well-known "Brush Brotherhood" at work in the vast open spaces, while in the cities are hospitals and social services chaplains as well as a very active Youth work.

When in that vicinity it seemed a pity not to visit New Zealand but our detour in that direction was ill fated. When our plane was 400 miles out from Sydney one of the motors gave out in face of a strong headwind and heavy rain, with the result that we were forced down within a few feet of the rough Tasman Sea. We were ordered to don our life belts for the splash, when the pilot decided to jettison the freight and so lighten the ship, with the result that in five minutes—which seemed five hours—we rose to about 100 feet and then providentially the rain lightened and we were able to gain altitude and limp back to Sydney. Every bit of our clothing and personal belongings, including my vestments, were lost and, though some things are irreplaceable, we were thankful to get off with our lives. On reaching Sydney the Archbishop told me that at the Synod, then in session, special prayers were being offered for us at the very hour of our danger, and that one of his clergy told him he had felt an irresistible urge to go into the chapel and pray, which he did for some quarter of an hour. Truly prayer does bind Christians together "by gold chains about the throne of God."

Having engagements in New Zealand I felt I should keep, if possible, we took the same plane the next day, though I must confess it was not a very comfortable trip. However, we arrived safely, but my time was too short to enable me to get much impression of the Church. Like that in Australia, it has its Cathedrals and Bishopscourts, and it seems to be concerned with some of the questions that at times plague us, namely, parochial self-centeredness and differences about ceremonial. How much time and energy is thus wasted on trivia which might be used to the advancement of the Kingdom of God!

Both countries because of their great distance away suffer a bit from isolationism; and the White Australian policy, a result of their fears, cannot be justified as either good Christianity or good politics. When will we Anglo-Saxons learn that we are not a chosen people in the world nor do we have any monopoly of learning and culture?

On our return we spent about a week in Honolulu and had the opportunity of seeing a good deal of the very important and splendid work now being done there. The Cathedral under the able leadership of Anson P. Stokes is a hive of activities. On Sundays the Cathedral itself is filled with a congregation of all kinds and ages of people, a sprinkling of the Army and Navy and many young people. At the same time in a chapel,

really a fair-sized separate Church building, there is a good and very active Hawaiian congregation. During the week there are the usual number of parochial guilds and societies and a very important work for the young men of the Army and Navy under the very competent direction of Mrs. Moore. In Honolulu and throughout the islands are many other congregations, some Chinese, Japanese, Hawaiian and some where all worship together, as for instance in the splendid little parish under the competent and devoted leadership of Fr. Souder. The occasional separation of races is for purely practical reasons and not on racial grounds, for there seems to be here a complete absence of race consciousness. For example, I talked to the boys of Ialani School, where there are some 750 boys, only about a dozen being pure whites, some of them from the best families and enthusiastically devoted to the School. Perhaps Hawaii has something to teach us all on the race question.

On the whole I am convinced that here at the Cross Roads of the Pacific is a strategic place for our Church to make large investments. The Roman Catholics, Baptists, Presbyterians and others are spending generously for the acquisition of property and the provision of clergy. Our own work is deserving of more support from the Church at home and locally. Both are needed and possible. The Cathedral Budget, generous as compared with similar institutions at home, is met almost entirely by the congregation which would seem to indicate a capacity for self-support. It may be that the Cathedral contains most of the well to do and well disposed American or Hawaiian Churchmen; but there are other people of means on the islands who, if their imagination could be caught with the possibilities before our Church, might be of substantial help. Whether this be so or not—and my acquaintance is too slight for a valid judgment—I am convinced that at the present time and under the present leadership the Church in Hawaii both needs and deserves the most generous support both from its own members and its Mother Church.

---

Dr. James Arthur Muller, Professor of Church History at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, died at the Seminary—1945. He had been teaching at the School since 1914, except for one period spent at mission teaching in Wuchang, China.

Dr. Muller was much beloved of all the generations of Cambridge men who studied under him. His Christian love expressed itself in his life, as in the lives of few of us. His teaching was clear, simple, and easily remembered. His insistence upon promptness and detail are looked

back upon by many of his students with gratitude. His hospitality was widely known.

As a student of the Reformation period, Dr. Muller, achieved a high respect for Anglicanism as a way of life which could stand upon its own feet. His classes were all shown Anglican vestments—apparels, very full albes, etc.—and taught how to put them on, what they meant, and where their sources lay. In teaching how to celebrate the Holy Eucharist, he pointed out that the elements might preferably be prepared before the Service, that a chalice veil is entirely unnecessary, and that the bread should be broken in the sight of the people above the priest's head.

A member of the Anglican Society, Dr. Muller was the author of many books and articles, best known of which is *The Apostle of China*, Harpers, New York. His strong faith in an Anglicanism which could stand on its own heritage should be an inspiration to the many who knew him.

T. J.

---

We are happy to announce the appointment as West Coast Representative of The Anglican Society of the Rev. Merrill A. Norton, rector of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, Downey, California. He has accepted the appointment.

Also we are glad that the Rev. George Grambs of Bayonne, N. J., has accepted appointment as Chairman of the Extension Committee.

---

#### **NEW EDITOR FOR "THE NEW START"**

Congratulations to the staff and readers of "The New Start" on the acceptance of the editorship by the Rev. Frank Damrosch, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Doylestown, Pa.

Under Father Damrosch we may be sure that "The New Start" will be spritely and interesting and at the same time offer a popular but solid contribution to the setting forth and defense of the Church's faith. Our best wishes to "The New Start" and its Editor.

## AN ANGLICAN SOCIETY DIRECTORY

Honorary President: *The Rt. Rev. G. Ashton Oldham, D. D.*  
68 South Swan St.  
Albany 6, N. Y.

President: *The Very Rev. Edward R. Welles*  
St. Paul's Cathedral,  
Buffalo 2, N. Y.

Vice President: *The Rev. J. Wilson Sutton, D. D.*  
1 West 72nd St.,  
New York, N. Y.

Secretary: *The Rev. Charles E. Hill*  
Twin Oaks,  
Williamstown, Mass.

Treasurer: *Mr. William Lackman*  
Livingston, Columbia Co., N. Y.

Chairman Extension Committee: *The Rev. George Grambs*  
Bayonne, N. J.

Editor, THE ANGLICAN, *The Rev. William H. Dunphy, Ph. D.*  
St. Mark's Church  
1625 Locust Street  
Philadelphia, Pa.

Managing Editor: *The Rev. Allen Brown*  
-- Christ Church  
Hudson, N. Y.

The objects of the American Branch of the Anglican Society are:

1. To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer.
2. To uphold and appreciate the Anglican Use both in rite and ceremonial.

Membership is invited on the broad principle of loyalty to the American Prayer Book, Constitution and Canons and the Common Law of the Anglican Communion. Apply to either the Secretary or the Chairman of the Extension Committee for membership. The dues are \$2.00 a year which includes subscription to "The Anglican."

